

## Industrial Relations at Queen's: The First Fifty Years

Laurence Kelly

Volume 42, numéro 3, 1987

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/050331ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/050331ar>

[Aller au sommaire du numéro](#)

Éditeur(s)

Département des relations industrielles de l'Université Laval

ISSN

0034-379X (imprimé)

1703-8138 (numérique)

[Découvrir la revue](#)

Citer cet article

Kelly, L. (1987). Industrial Relations at Queen's: The First Fifty Years. *Relations industrielles / Industrial Relations*, 42(3), 475–499.  
<https://doi.org/10.7202/050331ar>

### Résumé de l'article

Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations congratulates Queen's University on its fiftieth anniversary, in 1987, of the founding of the Industrial Relations Centre. A pioneer in the industrial relations field among Canadian universities, Queen's has constantly played a role of leadership. Its historic and continuing efforts are much appreciated by everyone involved in this field of enquiry. In order to further the understanding of the various aspects of the task undertaken, as well as the contribution of the people involved, we are very pleased to present our readers with the following study done by Queen's Industrial Relations Centre.

# *Industrial Relations at Queen's*

## *The First Fifty Years*

**Laurence Kelly**

*Relations industrielles/Industrial Relations congratulates Queen's University on its fiftieth anniversary, in 1987, of the founding of the Industrial Relations Centre. A pioneer in the industrial relations field among Canadian universities, Queen's has constantly played a role of leadership. Its historic and continuing efforts are much appreciated by everyone involved in this field of enquiry. In order to further the understanding of the various aspects of the task undertaken, as well as the contribution of the people involved, we are very pleased to present our readers with the following study done by Queen's Industrial Relations Centre.*

Kingston, Ont. Sept. 20. — Queen's University has decided to establish an Industrial Relations Section in the School of Commerce and Administration, Principal R.C. Wallace announced today. Prof. W.A. Mackintosh is director of the school.

Decision to establish the section was reached, Principal Wallace said, after consultation with leading industrialists, labor officials and industrial relations experts. Financial support for a five-year period has been obtained from «a number» of industrial corporations in arrangements that insure work of the section will be «unfettered and unbiased», the principal said.

An expert will be appointed soon to take immediate charge of the work, the announcement added.

The above news article, or a variation of it, appeared in newspapers across Canada in late September 1937. Those which used more of the press release issued by the university noted that a library and information centre was to be established «covering the whole field of industrial relations and the policies and practices which obtain in Canadian industry in the relationships and responsibilities of management and labour in particular».

---

• KELLY, Laurence, now an independent researcher and consultant, Kingston.

•• The author has been associated with the Industrial Relations Centre from 1960 to 1976 and served as its Assistant Director for three years.

The announcement generated a considerable amount of interest, as evidenced by the many inquiries that came into Queen's about the new Section, and it attracted favourable comment from many quarters. In a letter to Principal Wallace, the Secretary of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce wrote: «This is certainly a progressive and timely move and one which, I believe, will prove highly useful to both business and labour leaders throughout Canada.» P.M. Draper, President of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, wrote to wish Wallace «every success in the work which you are planning with the object of building up a cooperative understanding in the many and complex problems which affect industrial management in labor today». The editor-in-chief of *The Financial Times*, in an article entitled «For Better Industrial Relations», commented, «One of the most successful of American industrial leaders has emphasized that about the most important thing in modern business is to conduct operations on the basis of giving the public efficient service, good value and a square deal all-round-and the next most important thing to tell the people about it. But important as are public relations, it is doubtful if they are more important in these times than employee relations — employee relations based on the idea that workers must be given broader recognition for their services than the contents of the pay envelope».

As these comments indicate, even before it formally came into existence the Industrial Relations Section at Queen's was off to a good start. The first institution of its kind in Canada, it was wanted and welcomed. It officially came into operation on October 12, 1937, under the directorship of a new Queen's appointee, Professor J.C. Cameron.

### THE MOVING SPIRITS

The decision to establish an Industrial Relations Section at Queen's was not an overnight one. More than a year of planning and preparation and persuasion lay behind it. And but for the commitment of a fortuitous combination of individuals and organizations, it is an idea that probably never would have taken shape.

In identifying the moving spirits behind the establishment of the Section one has to begin with Clarence J. Hicks, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Industrial Relations Counselors Inc., New York, a non-profit organization established in 1926 by John D. Rockefeller II. Unlike others involved, Hicks had no connection with Queen's. However, he had been instrumental in helping to form Industrial Relations Sections at Princeton University (1922), the University of Michigan (1934) and Stanford University (1936). Another was in the process of being established in 1937 at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. The Section at Queen's was to be modelled on similar lines. In a manner of speaking, it was Hicks' Canadian franchise.

Hicks' views on the role of universities in industrial relations stemmed largely from impressions formed in earlier years when he was in charge of industrial relations at Standard Oil of New Jersey, in which capacity he received invitations to address labour classes in various universities. He con-

cluded from these visits that students were not receiving a balanced picture of labour relations. As he stated later in his autobiography, *My Life in Industrial Relations*, the approach of universities and colleges to labour relations «has been theoretical and usually under the direction of a professor in economics who, in most cases, has had but little practical touch or experience with labor relations, scanty knowledge of labor unions, and incomplete information concerning current developments in the field of employer-employee relations».

In 1921, following a visit to Princeton University where he expressed his views to faculty and students about the need for more relevant instruction in industrial relations, Hicks was asked by the President of the university to explain what he thought Princeton could do in this direction. Hicks outlined what he chose to call an «Industrial Relations Section» to be organized as a subdivision of the Department of Economics. The suggested program included:

1. Gathering of current information concerning every type of labour relationship in the United States and Canada and also current information concerning legislation on this subject throughout the world.
2. Giving unbiased instruction based on facts thus gathered rather than on theories.
3. Offering opportunities for research as to every type of labour relationship, and
4. Making this current information available not only to the faculty and the student but to businessmen and union leaders and any others interested in this subject.

As reported by Hicks, this program was «unanimously approved» and John D. Rockefeller, Jr., «was easily persuaded to provide, as his first gift to Princeton, the budget for a five-year program starting in 1922».

Hicks was to play an important role in the formation of the Section at Queen's, which would have objectives similar to those of Princeton's. At least equally important, however, was the part played by his Director of Research at Industrial Relations Counselors Inc., Bryce M. Stewart.

Bryce Stewart was a Canadian, a graduate of Queen's who also held a PhD in economics from Columbia University. Following completion of his graduate studies at Columbia in 1914, he served for a number of years with the Canadian Department of Labour as researcher, chief statistician, editor of *The Labour Gazette*, and organizer and director of the Employment Service of Canada. In 1922, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America invited him to Chicago to organize an employment exchange, to be followed by a system of unemployment insurance. He spent five years there, developing what was then the largest system of non-governmental unemployment insurance in the United States, before moving to New York to join Hicks and IRC. Stewart's knowledge of industrial relations, his many contacts in the field, and, of course, his interest in Queen's, made him an invaluable resource in developing the Section at Queen's.

There were moving forces within Queen's too. The primary one was W.A. Mackintosh, Head of the Department of Commerce and Administration. Mackintosh, who later was to become Principal of Queen's, was a highly regarded and frequently consulted adviser to government on economic and social problems, one of a group of economists who had established a reputation for Queen's in the area of applied economics. He was quick to recognize that industrial relations was an important, emerging field of study and that an Industrial Relations Section could make a significant contribution to the work of his department and the university. As he was to say in a speech in 1938: «... no excuse is needed for making industrial relations a subject of university study and investigation. It is much less what we study than how we study it that is of importance. I have no patience with those frightened people who would desire to attain or retain a respectable reputation by clinging to subjects made respectable by age and convention. Industrial relations are a part of life — an important and even critical phase of modern life. In no field do the significant problems of social control arise more sharply and in more complex form than here. Whether one assesses it by the intellectual effort required, or by the worthwhileness of results achieved, university work in this field is amply justified.»

In making these comments, Mackintosh might have had in mind a former Queen's principal, W. Hamilton Fyfe. Fyfe, who resigned in 1934, felt that the educational system was dominated by the business ethos of North American society and therefore heavily oriented toward practical knowledge. The true object of education was «soul-making» and the function of a university «... to aid human beings in their growth of character, in the healthy development of all their faculties, physical, mental, moral, aesthetic and spiritual»<sup>1</sup>. One wonders whether Mackintosh could have convinced Fyfe that university work in industrial relations was «amply justified» and, if he could have done so, whether Fyfe would have been willing to make the rounds of company presidents to raise the money needed to finance an Industrial Relations Section.

Mackintosh had little difficulty in convincing Principal R.C. Wallace about the desirability of establishing an Industrial Relations Section and Wallace did not shirk the heavy work load that this was to impose on him. The Principal was a practical man, a scientist and former president of the University of Alberta, with the reputation of being a good administrator.

Within a few months of taking over as Principal on September 1, 1936, he had given his approval to Mackintosh's proposal and presented a plan to the university Senate and the Executive of the Board of Trustees. From there, events ran their course.

There were others who played important facilitating roles in the establishment of the Section. W.C. (Clifford) Clark, Deputy Minister of Finance and a former Head of Economics at Queen's, provided advice and assistance. University Chancellor James Richardson used his influence in the business world to win promises of financial support from corporations.

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in Frederick W. Gibson, *Queen's University, To Serve and Yet Be Free*, Volume II 1917-1961, pp. 128-9.

Several practitioners in the industrial relations field were involved in the planning from the earliest stage, most notably Clare Fraser of Bell Canada, a founding member of the Montreal Personnel Association, which had been formed in 1935, and Clare Seeley, first president of the Personnel Association of Toronto, which came into existence in January 1936.

The establishment of the Industrial Relations Section at Queen's ultimately was dependent on the contributions of another group of individuals — those who agreed to provide the financial support necessary to translate the idea to reality. The key players, however, the «moving spirits», were those who conceived the idea and developed and carried through the plan, principally Hicks, Stewart, Mackintosh and Wallace. Take away any one of these persons and it is unlikely that the idea ever would have taken wing.

### FROM IDEA TO REALITY

As Clare Fraser recalled it, the idea of forming an Industrial Relations Section in Central Canada was conceived at the Princeton Industrial Relations Conference, September 1935, during a chat between him and Bryce Stewart. During that conversation, Stewart agreed to work on the idea from New York while Fraser was to work on it with Canadian groups.

The initial outcome was a plan for an Industrial Relations Conference at Queen's, to be sponsored jointly by the university and the fledgling Montreal and Toronto Personnel Associations. The planning committee consisted of Mackintosh, Fraser and Seeley.

Held on Friday and Saturday, September 18-19, 1936, this first Canadian university conference on industrial relations was well supported, attracting more than 100 participants. It covered a wide range of topics. Mackintosh spoke on «The Task of the National Employment Commission», Stewart on «The Search for Security», Hicks on «The Position of the Industrial Relations Man Today», and J. Douglas Brown, Director of the Industrial Relations Section at Princeton University, on «Industrial Relations and the University». In addition, there were papers and talks on day-to-day aspects of industrial relations and personnel by speakers representing business and unions, and on social security issues by academics from the University of Toronto and McGill University. The Hon. C.D. Howe, Minister of Transport, addressed a luncheon meeting on the subject «The Relations of Business and Government in Canada».

Those attending the conference were mainly senior industrial relations and personnel managers from large companies in Canada and the United States though there was more than a sprinkling of representatives from government, universities and other educational institutions. Recently appointed Principal R.C. Wallace officially welcomed the participants and also chaired the dinner meeting at which Hicks spoke.

This first conference was so well received, Clare Fraser later reported, that plans for a 1937 conference developed almost spontaneously. «At this point, at the suggestion of the executives of the two associations, Queen's, through Dr. Mackintosh, took over the leadership».

Early in November 1936, Mackintosh and Wallace met with Stewart and Clark to discuss the feasibility of establishing an Industrial Relations Section at Queen's. We can only presume what the scope of the discussion was but from Mackintosh's written follow-up to Wallace on November 13 it appears that it probably covered questions of what the work of a Section would be, how it would be financed, and what the personnel and financial requirements were. It is evident, too, that Mackintosh was advised to first get the approval of other members of the Department of Commerce and Administration.

Mackintosh reported back that he had taken up the question with the other members of the Department and that «it was unanimously agreed that the work of the Department would be greatly strengthened at a vital point by the establishment of such a Section, and that a valuable service could be rendered by the University to Industry». He went on to outline tentatively what the work of such a Section would be: «1) part-time teaching in the Commerce and Arts courses; 2) investigation and research in industrial relations problems; 3) dissemination of information and analyses to those who were actually engaged in the work of industrial relations; 4) («at a later stage, and probably not initially») extra-mural instruction for those who were working in the field; and 5) the continuation and extension of the Conference work which we began here successfully last September». As Mackintosh saw it, the requirements for setting up a Section would include a full-time man of senior rank, a research librarian, a stenographer-research worker, library, office and travel expenses, and increased office accommodation (in words that would be repeated over the years), «our present space in the Commerce Building is completely filled up». He estimated an annual budget of approximately 10 000\$ — about 100 000\$ in today's terms.

Mackintosh concluded by recommending to the Principal that «a resolution be presented to the proper University authority, endorsing the establishment of a Chair in Industrial Relations, and the organization of an Industrial Relations Section in the combined Departments of Political and Economic Science, and Commerce and Administration». Recognizing that at a time when the university was facing severe financial pressures it would be unlikely to approve any plan that involved new expenditures, he added that «the actual establishment should be made contingent on the financial outlay being provided from some other source than the general University budget». Appended to his letter was a list of individuals and firms mentioned as possible contributors to a five-year industrial relations program.

A resolution similar to that proposed by Mackintosh was quickly presented to the University Senate and the Executive of the Board of Trustees. What was approved, however, was a watered-down version of Mackintosh's proposal. As Wallace explained in a letter to Hicks, December 8, 1936, «The plan was left designedly somewhat open and tentative, the opinion being expressed that it is better to begin in a smaller way and build up through the work itself to a large scheme... To some of the Trustees it seemed that, if, to begin with, a young man could be obtained in a junior position, who is able and relatively experienced in this field, and who could give part of his time to lecture courses and part to close relation-

ships with the industrial relations work in the industries in Canada, this would build up to a larger program as time went on.» He added that, with this approach, the cost might not even be half the estimated 10 000\$. Going on to the purpose of the letter, he asked if Hicks «might be willing to give us a little time to explore the matter with some of the Corporations in Canada who might see the value in this work being initiated here», extending an invitation to him to come to Canada as the guest of the University to discuss the matter with them and also to interview some of the Corporations with offices in Toronto and Montreal.

In a rather lengthy reply, Hicks expressed the view that the suggestion made by Trustees «would simply mean a revision of the present program of labor instruction at Queen's, which revision would be in line with what is being undertaken by a large number of universities throughout North America». He contrasted that approach with what was being done at Princeton, Ann Arbor and Stanford, where industrial relations sections were centres of information and influence not only as to their own students but as to a large number of employers and employees and labour organizations. Unless Queen's felt that there was a need for this larger development, which could be expected to cost at least 9-10 000\$ a year, «you could hardly expect to enlist the cooperation or financial backing of industrial or corporation leaders». If this larger development were not needed, he added, «you could probably secure the 5 000\$ or less from among the regular supporters of the University».

Wallace undoubtedly recognized that he was faced with an all-or-nothing choice, for if it would be unwise to approach corporations and industrial leaders to provide financial support for anything less than a Section, it would be unrealistic to think that 5 000\$ could be allocated from university appeal funds to finance a lesser project, there were too many other claims on that money. He wrote back to Hicks, saying: «I have the feeling ... that the way would be open fully to go forward on the basis which you suggest if the money can be obtained. The only real condition which the Trustees made was that the work be financed outside the ordinary funds available in the University.» Hicks could assume, he said, that the university would be prepared to go forward for five years on the basis of a plan such as that which he had suggested.

Assured that Queen's was serious about establishing an Industrial Relations Section, Hicks wrote to Wallace on December 28, 1936, informing him that he had already discussed the matter with representatives of three different companies, who were ready to recommend their fair proportion of support, and that between then and the end of March he expected to correspond with or interview representatives of several other companies, «with the idea of taking a week or two about April 1 to follow through with these corporations and get their support in definite form».

Hicks made his promised visit in April, securing promises of support from several corporations in Toronto, Ottawa and Montreal. And in the meantime, the Board of Trustees gave its approval to the proposal that it had earlier sought to modify, simultaneously raising the status of the



Department of Commerce and Administration to that of a School, with Mackintosh as head. The plan to establish an Industrial Relations Section, within that School, was now well under way.

It was Wallace's task to follow up on the pledges that Hicks had obtained, which he was able to do in some cases by letter but in others only after visits to corporations to personally collect signed promises. Letters also went out under the Principal's signature to other likely prospects though with mixed response, some balking at the amount requested (a figure of 500\$ a year for five years was suggested), or stating that the request should more appropriately go to the industry rather than to one corporation, or that they had already made contributions to Queen's and other universities etc.

It helped to have James Richardson in the wings. Richardson's own firm contributed 1 000\$ to the cause. But apart from that, he could write letters that Wallace could not, like the letter to International Nickel Company president Robert Stanley, in which he not only outlined the work of the planned Section but gave Wallace a glowing reference, with a personal touch added («Your big fish came through promptly in beautiful condition and was devoured by my family with great satisfaction.»). The response was a 1 500\$ pledge, subject only to the willingness of the Principal to drive to Sudbury to pick it up.

Richardson's influence, however, went only so far. He struck out in his approach to General Motors of Canada president R.S. McLaughlin (later a generous benefactor of Queen's). As he explained to Wallace, «he states they had a very happy family in Oshawa which was working out very nicely in the interests of all concerned, but it was badly upset by the C.I.O. last winter, and they are now endeavouring to restore again the relationship which used to exist between the company and the men».

«He has talked over the contents of my letter with some of his colleagues and they have come to the conclusion that they would not wish to make a contribution or associate themselves with the work contemplated at Queen's, and in coming to this conclusion he referred to the work of the college economists who had been associated with President Roosevelt».

By mid-August, Mackintosh was able to report to Wallace that the total amount now pledged was 11 100\$. That represented contributions from 14 companies in amounts ranging from 500\$ to 1 500\$. Another two came in shortly after, bringing the total to 11 850\$. That was a good way short of the 15 000\$ that Hicks now felt would be necessary to provide an adequate budget and only a small part of it was guaranteed for five years. But it was enough to ensure that the Section could survive for the first year.

## THE CAMERON YEARS

Though he was to be referred to in later years as «Mr. Industrial Relations» James C. (Jim) Cameron was a relatively unknown figure in the field when he was appointed Head of the Industrial Relations Section at Queen's in 1937. His credentials, as outlined by Mackintosh in the published pro-

ceedings of the Second Industrial Relations Conference at Queen's in September 1937, were that he had had «experience as a factory worker, a student of economics and commerce, for four years as a research assistant, and for four years as Economist for Canada Packers Ltd., devoting much of his time to industrial relations». Then 42, Cameron was probably somewhere between the «man of senior rank» whom Mackintosh had stated as a requirement and «able and relatively experienced» junior whom the Trustees had initially suggested as appropriate for the position.

Cameron was not the first person thought of during the search for a Section Head. That, not surprisingly, was Bryce Stewart. However, after discussing the matter in New York with Clifford Clark, Stewart wrote to Mackintosh regretfully declining the opportunity. «As I ponder his job», he said, «it seems somewhat outside the professor classification. The man will have to be on the job twelve months in the year except for a few weeks' vacation and he will have to do considerable traveling. There will be relatively little opportunity to enjoy the quiet shade of the professor's life». Cameron (and his successor) undoubtedly came to that same conclusion. But Cameron took on the job with enthusiasm, launching himself into the task of building up the new Section.

The challenge that faced him was a large one, first because of the wide scope of the industrial relations field as it was seen by Queen's, and secondly because of the many responsibilities with which the Section was charged. One can add to that the fact that it was virtually a one-person job — the rest of the staff consisted of a research assistant, a stenographer and a part-time office assistant.

The term «industrial relations» was not defined in any of the Section's documents but it is obvious from the range of topics covered in conferences and publications that it was construed in the same broad way as it was by Hicks. As Hicks defined it, «industrial relations» included the development and administration of policy on all matters connected with or growing out of the employment relationship which concern employees and the various levels of management. More specifically, according to the definition that he prepared for Scribner's Dictionary of American History:

hiring, placement, transfer, training, discipline, promotion, layoff, and termination of employees, together with proper service records; also all of the financial relationships, such as wages and salaries, overtime rates, bonuses and profit sharing, savings and thrift and stock plans; also education, health, safety and sanitation, recreation, housing and employees' service activities; hours of labour and other working conditions, including days of rest and vacations; reasonable provision to help meet the common economic hazards involved in temporary or total unemployment, sickness, accident, old age, disability and death; also methods used to adjust differences and to promote cooperation between employees and management.

The planned activities of the Section potentially covered all of the above areas. As explained in an early announcement, there were five primary activities. These were:

The development of a comprehensive information centre for industrial relations material. The library of the Section, which would be a subdivision of the

University library, would contain few textbooks. Rather, the emphasis would be upon company and trade union pamphlets, magazines, collective agreements, as well as material «touching upon every aspect of activity with which the Dominion and Provincial Governments are concerned».

The preparation of reports on subjects of immediate and vital interest in the field of industrial relations. Material for these reports would be obtained by means of correspondence and interviews with informed persons in the field.

The preparation of specific reports in response to inquiries directed to the Section by interested persons throughout the country. In addition to the more formal reports mentioned above, the Section would answer inquiries for specific information on company and trade union progress and recent legislation.

The holding of conferences of industrial relations executives, industrial relations men, government and labour officials and university men. The conferences held in each of the previous two years, the announcement said, had convinced the university that it had an important function to perform in this field. It was planned to develop conferences still more useful in program and composition.

Instruction in the Faculty of Applied Science and in the School of Commerce and Administration. This would largely be confined to keeping students in touch with the problems in the field in an effort to provide understanding of the implications of various plans and proposals. There was «no thought of trying to turn out industrial relations experts».

This was a rather ambitious program for a small Section but in his report to the University for the year ended June 30, 1938, covering the first nine months of the Section's operation, Cameron was able to document accomplishments on nearly all fronts (the exception was conferences — the next annual conference was scheduled for September 1938). The summary of activities included the following:

1. Visits to Meetings of Employers' Associations, to Cooperating companies, to Trade Union Offices, etc. Between October 1937 and June 1938, the Head of the Section visited numerous persons and sought their interest and cooperation. «Invariably he received a cordial reception.»
2. Clearing-House Activities. Companies and other interested parties could secure from the Section compilations of the experience of other companies contributing information. «Practically any problem coming within the scope of industrial relations (company practice, labour legislation, trade union activities, etc.) may now be submitted to the Section with a fair expectation of receiving a prompt and comprehensive answer.»
3. Correspondence. Some 2 000 questionnaires, circulars and letters were sent out by the Section during this period.
4. Direct Service to Industry and to the General Public. The Section had answered 65 requests for information and material from employers, labour officials, students and private research organizations, provincial government departments and individuals. Some of the subjects on which information was sought were profit sharing, employee bonuses, dealing with organized labour.

pension plans, group insurance, employee representation plans, wages and hours of employees in Ontario and Quebec, workmen's compensation legislation and employment of women in industry.

5. Formal studies. Two publications were to be released in July 1938. These were «Industrial Retirement Plans in Canada» — a survey of 120 retirement plans in actual operation in Canada, and a discussion of the principles to be considered, and «The Right to Organize — Recent Canadian Legislation» — a survey of provincial legislation respecting the right to organize.

6. Education. In addition to lectures to students, Cameron reported that he had given seven addresses to Personnel Associations and other groups on the work of the Section or on specific problems, a radio address on the work of the Section, and had written five articles about the Section for magazines and periodicals. Mention was also made of two addresses given by Trade Union Leaders to the student body.

During this first year in particular, there was little opportunity for Cameron to enjoy the «quiet shade» of university life. It was a period of intense activity, with extra pressure put on him by the fact that only three of the 16 corporations that had given financial support to the Section had guaranteed their contributions for five years — the others were to be solicited annually and presumably would be assessing what had been accomplished. If renewals were an independent measure of success, Cameron came through the first year with flying colours for all of the contributors agreed to continue their subscriptions, though the total amount was down slightly since one company reduced its contribution because it was the only one in the industry assisting.

The work load did not get any lighter. The 1939 Report noted that the Section was steadily accumulating information, its staff gradually developing experience, and its services being used by an increasing number of people. Over 700 companies and many labour unions were contributing information to the clearinghouse, which was being used to answer requests, prepare research studies, and train students. As well as directing all of this, Cameron had been busy too with teaching responsibilities, addresses to outside groups, and the preparation of «articles dealing with various phases of Industrial Relations ... for several journals and periodicals.»

The 1939 Report also described a new undertaking by the Section — a Short Course in Industrial Relations, of particular interest because it was to become a continuing activity through the years. The course as a five-day affair, held late May to early June, and was aimed at plant superintendents and lower line managers as well as people who were relatively junior in the industrial relations field. Among the speakers were Bryce Stewart, on «Organization of Industrial Relations in Large and Small Companies», and Professor Jacob Finkelman, University of Toronto, on «The Law and Labour Relations in Ontario». Other topics covered were Selection, Placement and Training; Wages and Wage Differentials; Group Relations; and Public Relations.

A few points from a report written by one of the 25 participants attending this first course gives a bit of the flavour of the proceedings as well as

some insight into the Section, in particular its willingness to provide every assistance to participants. There were not many conferences and seminars at Queen's back then and those attending them were not accommodated in university residences. Thus, «we arrived in Kingston early Sunday evening and spent some time looking up our boarding houses», the reporter began. On Monday morning, following introductions and a discussion about the scope of the field and its importance, «the class proceeded to the Industrial Relations Section and were there introduced to the various members of Mr. Cameron's staff. Miss Wilson, the librarian ... proceeded to give us a general idea of the books she had in her Library, all of which were available during our stay in Kingston». Miss Wilson, he added, «certainly knows her work and without the slightest hesitation can either give one a direct answer or produce a reference from one of her books on practically any question submitted to her».

Before concluding the morning session, Cameron explained to the group that the Section had «an unlimited supply of information» on industrial relations, all of which would be available during their stay. He added «after we returned to our respective homes we were at liberty at any time to write him in regard to our particular problems and told us that if it was in his power to supply the information desired, he would see that it was sent along to us and such information would be furnished without charge». It is small wonder that Cameron and his staff were overworked!

The remainder of the account consists of a detailed summary of the proceedings, which ran in three-hour sessions, three sessions a day, ending about 10.30 or 11 p.m. A good part of the time was spent in group discussions and in question periods «which seemed to be the most beneficial part of the whole program. One question led to many others and there was always a lot of discussion and information forthcoming». Cameron's own assessment of the experiment was that it was successful and in his annual Report he stated that it would be repeated the following year «if industry feels such instruction serves a useful purpose». In one form or another, it was repeated many times.

The outbreak of war brought changes in the work of the Section. The annual conference which had been scheduled for September 1939 was cancelled but one was held the following April. Whereas at the early conferences (1937-38 particularly) the interest lay in such matters as «Interviewing the Worker», «Training the Worker», «Paying the Worker», «Job Evaluation Methods», and «Welfare Plans», the conferences held in 1940 and 1941 placed more emphasis on long-run questions of economic and public policy. Topics for discussion included «Labour Supply and National Defence», «Dealing with Organized Labour», «The Nature, Meaning and Consequences of Inflation», «Wage Policy during the War», and «Machinery for the Prevention and Settlement of Industrial Disputes».

The formal annual conference was not held in 1942, and, in fact, would not be held again for many years. As Cameron said at the time, «Conferences [for the time being] seemed inappropriate. There was a crying need for professional training and we attempted to meet it». The professional training included the one-week short course and, in 1942, a four-

week course in «Personnel Administration for War Industries», sponsored by the federal Department of Labour and designed for persons who were about to enter or had recently entered the personnel field.

Bryce Stewart, on leave from IRC as Deputy Minister of the federal Department of Labour, prevailed upon the University to release Cameron for four months during the winter of 1940-41 to serve as executive assistant to the Inter-departmental Committee on Labour Coordination. Cameron also began to find himself called upon to act as Chairman of Conciliation Boards. In the meantime, the regular clearinghouse and research work of the Section continued — a lengthy study on the Economic Welfare of Canadian Employees was published in 1940, a report on The Wartime Wage Policy of the Dominion Government in 1941, and a report on Trade Union Agreements in Canadian Industry in 1942. These were supplemented by periodic newsletter on wage changes, legislative developments, and other matters of current interest.

Other factors added to the demands on Cameron's time and that of the Section's staff. One of these was a new approach to the financing of the Section's work. The companies that had promised financial support in 1937 had continued their contributions but no effort had been made to broaden this base because, as Cameron reported in 1942, «it was confidently expected that at the end of five years the University would be able to support the work out of its own resources». The war, however, had disturbed these plans, university revenue was constantly decreasing, and it was therefore necessary for the Section to continue to secure all its funds from outside the University. It was decided to try to raise the minimum amount required to finance the Section through a total of 5 000\$ in annual contributions from large contributors and another 7 000\$ through supporting memberships of 100\$ or more per year. This approach was successful, almost too successful, for at the end of 1942 Cameron was writing to Wallace informing him that the Section now had 100 subscribers instead of 17 «and they are making demands, not because they are subscribers but because they have recently realized that we can be helpful to them. The confidence slowly built up through five years of contacts, both personal and written, is snow-balling and resulting in requests from far and wide, from governments and organizations as well as from business firms». The last straw on the overloaded back of the Section, he noted, was the current interest in collective bargaining in anticipation of both Ontario and federal legislation. Said Cameron, «The Section must be put in a position to cope with the vastly increased demands for its services if it is to maintain the goodwill which is essential to its continued existence».

Cameron's demands were modest — a trained librarian (to replace the invaluable Miss Wilson, who had left) and a good secretary-stenographer. Both requests were met but these holes were no sooner filled than another appeared — the resignation of Cameron's research assistant, Dorothy Wright. Cameron sought help from within the university. He wrote to Wallace in June 1943 with a suggestion to offer. «Mr. C.H. Curtis, who is doing part of Dr. Mackintosh's work, might have some spare time between July 1st and the end of the academic year. If he has, could I make an ar-

rangement with him to give me as much of it as possible in the Section? By the end of the next academic year I would then be in a position to judge whether Curtis was good enough for me and he, on the other hand, would know whether he wanted to devote his time to industrial relations». As it turned out, Curtis was good enough for Cameron and Curtis was interested in working in industrial relations. In fact, he was to spend the next 30-odd years at Queen's, developing a distinguished reputation in the field of grievance arbitration.

In 1944, the Industrial Relations Section became the Department of Industrial Relations. The change could be considered an elevation in the status of Cameron's group and it meant that faculty appointments could be made in the Department. It does not appear to have been made, however, for administrative or organizational reasons, but rather as a tribute to Cameron. As noted in the minutes of the Board of Trustees: «The Principal, Chairman and others spoke of the high regard in which Professor Cameron is held by both Industry and Labour. The Principal said that many subscriptions were made in appreciation of Professor Cameron's work as Head of the Industrial Relations Section. The suggestion was made that it might be regarded as an independent Department in order to make possible the payment to Professor Cameron of the salary of a Head of Department. The Principal stated that at the next meeting he would bring in a recommendation in his Staff Report.»

In 1945, a one-year diploma course was introduced by the Department to meet a demand from veterans for training in industrial relations. Some 29 students were enrolled that year. A few of them had university degrees, most held commissions in the armed forces. Although the program was introduced to meet what was believed at the time to be a temporary need, it was found that once started it could not easily be discontinued. Employers saw it as a valuable training for juniors entering into labour relations and personnel, many university graduates regarded it as the gateway to employment in industrial relations work. The program continued, though restricted from 1949 on to a maximum of 20 persons.

The diploma program provided a professional training to many who went on to hold senior position in industrial relations in Canada. The curriculum included courses in Personnel Administration; Labour Law and Collective Bargaining; Labour Problems; Employee Testing; Politics; Social Security; and Special Studies. Students whose undergraduate courses had not covered economics or psychology were generally required to enroll in a further course covering the principles of economics or industrial psychology.

Cameron and Curtis were still the only professors in the Industrial Relations Department and though they were assisted by other faculty at Queen's and by practitioners in the field the diploma program meant that much more time had to be given to teaching activities. The inevitable result was a de-emphasis of other activities. During the decade following the end of the war the Department held very few short courses and conferences, its publishing activities fell off, and its clearinghouse function was virtually phased out. Some of these changes, the latter in particular, could be at-

tributed to the growth or expanded activity of other organizations. For example, the federal Department of Labour was now periodically publishing summary collective agreement information based on much more data than the Department could hope to get — or analyse — and organizations such as the Central Ontario Industrial Relations Institute, the Niagara Industrial Relations Institute, and the Quebec Industrial Relations Institute (all of which the Department had helped to form) were providing the kind of assistance to employers, in more specialized form, that the Industrial Relations Section had once provided. By the mid-1950s, the primary function of the Department had become the teaching of industrial relations.

The problem with having nearly all its eggs in that one basket was that the basket was shrinking. In 1954-55 there were only eight students enrolled in the diploma program. The number went up to 17 the following year but that was still short of the number the Department was prepared to take. Either the demand for graduates was drying up or those interested in careers in the field were approaching it through different routes. Within the university questions began to be raised about the future direction of the Department.

The industrial relations program at Queen's was reviewed in 1956 by a group of practitioners in the field. Among the recommendations of this Committee were the following:

- The Department should not attempt to gather and keep up-to-date all material available on policies, programs and experience. The aim ought rather to be to maintain a small first-class library for use of students and staff.
- Members of the Department should keep in close touch with industry and labour, e.g. through chairing boards of conciliation and arbitration, through visits to outside organizations, through a meeting with trade union research directors.
- The Department should not attempt to hold large annual conferences. Rather it should hold seminars and study groups for junior and senior people from industry.
- The Department should resume publication of reports on subjects of immediate and vital interest. (Examples given included «The Effects of Collective Bargaining on the Economy», «Trends in Collective Bargaining Legislation», and «Contracting Out»).
- The Department should drop the one-year diploma course and instead give a master's degree on successful completion of a two-year post-graduate course.

Cameron was in agreement with most of these recommendations, the one exception being the proposal to drop the diploma program and introduce a master's degree. «It would be a mistake», he said, «to embark on such an ambitious scheme while our resources (both human and material) are so limited». On that point he had the support of Mackintosh, now Principal, though for different reasons. In Mackintosh's view, «particular care must be taken to avoid the creation of self-contained, watertight courses. Experience elsewhere shows that the latter type of instruction can lead to



separation from highly important fields of related knowledge, particularly economics». That statement, of course, could also be taken to apply to the diploma program, but Mackintosh had no immediate plans to discontinue that.

One very early result of the program review was the appointment of an additional member of the Department to assist with teaching responsibilities and to devote the rest of his time to the preparation of reports. The newcomer was F.J.L. (John) Young, a graduate of St. Andrews and Queen's who had some experience in industry. Between them, Cameron, Curtis and Young published a number of reports over the next three or four years, including studies on labour legislation, arbitration procedures, private pension plans, and supplemental unemployment benefit plans.

Cameron was getting close to retirement age — he would be 65 in 1960 — and the internal questions about the future of the Department had not been put to rest by the recommendations of the external review committee. Mackintosh might have been hinting at possible changes when he spoke at the Department's 21st anniversary conference in 1958 and talked in only general terms about the Department's plans for the future, noting that «undoubtedly there will be changes in emphasis from time to time». However, he left it to an internal committee to review the status of the Department, which it did early in 1960. The outcome of that was a decision to replace the Department of Industrial Relations with an Industrial Relations Centre.

Jim Cameron retired in the summer of 1960, having established a reputation for Queen's throughout Canada in the field of industrial relations. His lasting contributions were recognized in 1973 when he was awarded an honorary LLD degree by the University. The citation read:

**James Carruthers Cameron**

Scottish by birth, Canadian, Kingstonian, and Queen's man by adoption, pioneer practitioner and teacher in Canadian industrial relations; founder and head of the first University Industrial Relations Department in Canada at Queen's; as much at home in the world of affairs as in the classroom; his perseverance over twenty-three years as stimulating teacher, productive researcher and writer, wise counsellor of governments, effective arbitrator and conciliator, left an indelible imprint on the field of industrial relations throughout this country. His genuine idealism and concern for the dignity of man, coupled with a tough practicality, persuasive gentleness and pawky humour, have won him the lasting respect and friendship of over three hundred graduates of the Industrial Relations Professional Diploma Course and of his other undergraduate and graduate students, many now holding senior positions in Canada and abroad. For those who have studied or worked with him — and remember his insistence on labour being spelled with an «o-u-r» — he remains Canada's «Mr. Industrial Relations».

## **THE WOOD ERA**

The decision to eliminate the Department of Industrial Relations was «not adverse reflection on the work that Cameron and his colleagues had

done but a result of the recognition that educational needs were changing. The diploma program had served a valuable purpose but it had outlived its usefulness. Not only was enrolment low, the University undoubtedly had taken note of the interest shown by the Federation of Canadian Personnel Associations and the Personnel Association of Toronto in developing their own professional training programs. Perhaps more important, Queen's was in the process of expanding programs and courses offered in related disciplines — a Law School had been recently established, the Department of Economics now had a PhD program, and the School of Business (formerly the School of Commerce and Administration) introduced an MBA program in 1960. Together, these programs offered new opportunities to graduates who wished to work in the industrial relations field and they required specialized teaching expertise fitting the needs of the Department or School within which the programs were offered.

The establishment of the Industrial Relations Centre as a non-teaching unit within the University meant re-assignments of personnel. Connie Curtis was no longer a professor of industrial relations but a professor within the School of Business. John Young became a professor in the Department of Economics. The librarian and secretary of the former Department became the only full-time staff of the new Centre which was to be headed by a newly hired Director, Dr. W. Donald Wood. Wood was simultaneously appointed Associate Professor of Economics. The Centre, however, was not to be a section of the Economics Department but an independent unit, reporting directly to the Principal.

W. Donald (Don) Wood was a graduate of Queen's and McMaster Universities who had gone on to do a PhD in economics at Princeton, where he was influenced by people such as J. Douglas Brown and Richard Lester. Following his graduation from Princeton, he became head of the Research Division of the Employee Relations Department at Imperial Oil Ltd., which provided him with a practical experience that was to serve him well. But his interests went beyond day-to-day industrial relations problems. He had written his PhD thesis on white-collar unionism which had given him an appreciation of the important economic and demographic and other factors shaping the industrial relations field. That, indeed, was to become a theme of his work over the years. He could see the wide canvas of the field, «paint with a broad brush», and make it clear where there were important points of detail to be filled in. It was an approach and a talent that was invaluable in directing a multidisciplinary type of unit which had to concern itself with both academic and practitioner issues.

As Wood saw it, the functions of the Centre were fourfold. These were: 1) research — with an emphasis on ideas, interpretation of concepts, and questions of policy, public and private, rather than the detailed collection of statistics concerning prevailing practices; 2) the conducting of conferences and seminars which, as he saw it originally, would consist of selective programs dealing with important topics of the day; 3) policy-oriented relationships with industry, government and labour, a function that implied presentation of speeches and papers at conferences and conventions, as well as other constructive contacts; and 4) the operation of a specialized in-

dustrial relations library — «an indispensable tool for research, for graduate and undergraduate instruction, the conference program and for relationships with industry, labour and government».

The new Director applied himself energetically to all of these tasks. Within three years of taking over he had established a new series of publications. He had conducted research studies for the Senate Manpower Committee and the Royal Commission on Government Organization. He had written articles and presented papers. And he had held two major conferences for senior managers — one on «Forward Manpower Planning — the Industrial Relations Challenge of the 1960s», at which the various manpower issues facing the nation were discussed, and another on «Industrial Relations Aspects of Productivity». In addition, he had resurrected the former «short course» as an annual spring seminar, and run special seminars for managers in Eastern Ontario and for the construction industry. During this period, Wood also reorganized the library along the lines of similar special libraries at US industrial relations centres, and considerably expanded the Centre's mailing list, which was important in order to promote awareness of the Centre's activities.

Connie Curtis and John Young contributed to the Centre's research activities during these early years. Curtis was working on studies of Labour Arbitration and The Enforcement of the Collective Agreement, both of which were later published by the Centre. Young authored a book on the Contracting Out of Work — one of the subjects recommended for research by the 1956 Review Committee — and also published a shorter report on Adjustments to Technological Change. Curtis, however, with responsibilities in the School of Business, was not actively involved in the day-to-day work of the Centre and John Young resigned in 1963 to move to New Zealand (where he would later become Director of the Industrial Relations Centre at the University of Wellington). Wood found himself in essentially the same position, therefore, that Cameron had been in during most of his career at Queen's — overworked and understaffed.

One small advantage that he had over his predecessor was that he did not have to finance all of the Centre's activities from outside sources — as a Professor of economics his salary at least was paid by the University. Nevertheless, the Centre did have to finance independently the salaries of support staff as well as library acquisitions, equipment, and publication costs. While some of the long-time contributors continued to make annual donations, Wood recognized that the ability of the Centre to meet its goals was dependent on his ability to hire more staff and that was dependent on his ability to raise funds.

The Director had definite views about how funds should and should not be raised. He was opposed in principle to the idea of contract research or other «custom» work for clients. What he wanted was a broad base of financing which would ensure the Centre's independence and enable it to pursue its primary functions. As he saw it, that would include research grants, income from sales of publications and annual subscriptions, and revenue from conferences and seminars.

Conferences and seminars quickly became the primary source of funds. From the beginning, it was evident that Don Wood had a unique talent for planning, organizing and running programs that brought together as speakers leading authorities from industry, unions, government, universities and consulting firms. The annual spring seminar attracted about 100 participants each year — the maximum that could be accommodated — and other occasional conferences and seminars run during the early '60s were also well attended. Later on in 1966 — an annual «White Collar Seminar» was introduced, aimed mainly at those in white-collar industries and with an emphasis on the personnel function, personnel policies and human resource management. These various conferences and seminars brought in revenue and that revenue was used for expansion of the Centre's research, publishing and library functions.

This expansion was accompanied by an increase in the Centre's full-time and part-time staff. The writer was hired as a Research Associate in 1963. Frank Collom, now a professor in the School of Business at Queen's, came on staff shortly after. A professional librarian was recruited. Others were employed as editorial assistants (including Carol Williams, later the Centre's librarian), as library assistants, as summer research assistants. By the mid-1960s, the Centre had developed a substantially greater capacity to meet its objectives.

Even before this expansion began, Wood was fighting the first of his 1960s «space wars». When he came in 1960, the Centre had almost no physical space — three of the four offices that might be considered «Industrial Relations Centre» quarters were those allocated to Wood, Curtis and Young in their capacities as professors of economics or business. Negotiation brought the use of an artificially lit, unventilated interior office. However, space was severely limited in Dunning Hall, since the School of Business and the Departments of Economics and Political Science were growing and there was competition for any vacant square foot. The space problem hindered Wood's plans for expansion and in a report to Vice-Principal Deutsch early in 1963 he stressed that the most urgent, immediate need which must be filled was «the provision of adequate space to house all the various functions of the Centre». The request was not answered that year but the problem was recognized and plans made to find more appropriate quarters for the Centre. The solution was a move across the road to the ground floor of the Douglas Library, where the space, by comparison, seemed almost enormous, though quickly found to be no more than required.

The Centre's stay in the Douglas Library lasted just a few years. Mackintosh's words from the 1930s — «our present space... is completely filled up» — seemed to be echoing over the campus. By the late 1960s, the Library was insisting that the Centre's premises were urgently needed for its own uses. Wood had no objection to moving, provided that the Centre was guaranteed adequate space — and by then «adequate» meant something larger than it occupied at the time. The outcome was relocation in the top floor of the newly constructed Goodwin Hall, premises which it continues to occupy today.

The expansion of the Centre's activities during the 1960s could be attributed partly to the growth in the Department of Economics, in the School of Business, and in the Law School. The result of this growth was a substantial increase in the number of faculty teaching in various areas of the industrial relations field. Although they had no formal ties to the Centre, these «faculty associates» were a valuable resource. Some of them were speakers at the Centre's annual seminars or at special research seminars. A number of them prepared research studies for publication by the Centre — Innis Christie and Bernard Adell from Law, David Smith, David Dodge and David Sewell from Economics, Bryan Downie and John Willes from the School of Business. By 1970, the Centre could point to a significant record of publications in its research, reprint and bibliography series, some prepared within the Centre, some by faculty associates, others by persons from industry, government, administrative tribunals, and other universities.

There were important new publications during the first half of the 1970s, including studies on wage differentials, federal public service bargaining, teacher bargaining, the National Joint Council, and a Labour Relations Law Casebook, the latter the combined effort of a group of law professors at Queen's and other universities. The Current Industrial Relations Scene in Canada, a document originally prepared as a supplement to the Centre's seminars, became a major annual reference publication, providing information, data and commentary about trends and developments in all areas of the field. Other publications included conference proceedings, analyses of current issues, reprints of articles and conference papers, and annotated bibliographies. This steady flow of publications enabled the Centre to develop its research subscription program, which broadened the financial base of its operations and ensured that research could be published without concern about whether there was sufficient market demand for each individual publication.

An increasing proportion of the research output from about 1970 onward came from within the Centre. Dr. Pradeep Kumar, now Associate Director of the Centre, was a Research Associate in the early 1970s. As he points out, one cannot underestimate the contributions made by the Centre's own research staff. «Their research dealt with the real world — it was meant to inform, to provide timely comment on current issues, to contribute to public and private decision-making. It was an important component of the Centre's research subscription program.» It certainly has been a characteristic of the Centre's research staff, through to the present day, that they have not felt constrained by traditionalist views that research contributes to knowledge only if it is published in an academic journal. Mackintosh would have approved.

The late '60s and early '70s saw the Centre become involved in new initiatives. One of these was research conferences. In 1969, for example, it was co-sponsor of a North American Conference on Cost-Benefit Analysis of Manpower Policies, the proceedings of which were published by the Centre. In 1971, it was host to a meeting of Canadian labour economists on «Current Research Activities and Problems». In 1974, it conducted an Industrial Relations Orientation Seminar for students selected to participate

in a new Ontario Ministry of Labour program aimed at providing relevant work experience during the summer months. The Centre also added to its research capacity by providing fellowships for visiting researchers — Tom Johnston of Edinburgh University, Graham Reid from the University of Glasgow, Leslie Barnes, former president of the Professional Institute of the Public Service. There was always new activity. However, by 1974 the work of the Centre had become so almost routinely established that the Director felt he could afford to take a year's sabbatical leave in England, the first break he had had (and the only one he was to have) since joining Queen's.

In the mid- '70s, questions were being raised within the Centre about its future direction, in particular the question of whether it should be taking the initiative in introducing a graduate degree in industrial relations at Queen's. The University of Toronto recently had introduced such a program and Laval had a long-established graduate program in industrial relations. Queen's, with faculty resources equal to any university, had little to offer the person wishing to specialize in this field. Within the PhD program in economics, labour economics and industrial relations were just one part of a much more comprehensive course package — and on the labour side the emphasis was on labour economics. Within the MBA program, industrial relations also was just one component of a larger program, as were courses in labour law within the Law School curriculum. What was needed was a program that would enable graduates to cut across departmental lines and take labour courses offered in different disciplines.

The idea came to naught at the time. Perhaps it seemed like a step backward, for the university had rejected this concept at the end of the 1950s. However, there was a growing recognition that circumstances had changed and before the end of the decade the Centre had made the decision to pursue the objective of establishing a Master's program in industrial relations at Queen's.

The decision to establish a new program in industrial relations was not, of course, one that the Centre could make independently. It required the cooperation and support of the Schools and Departments within which industrial relations courses were offered. It involved internal and external review. It also entailed substantial consultation with the industrial relations community. It was a lengthy and difficult process. By 1982, however, the University Senate and the Board of Trustees had given their final approval to the establishment of a multi-disciplinary Master's degree program.

The new program, which began in September 1983, was a joint initiative of the Industrial Relations Centre, the Faculties of Business and Law, and the Department of Economics. The overall administration and coordination of it was the responsibility of a new School of Industrial Relations, which would be governed by a Faculty Board and an Executive Academic Committee of the Board composed of the heads of the four participating groups. The existing Centre would serve as the home base for the School and its students and the Centre's functions — research, publishing, and continuing education — would continue as already organized. Don Wood became Director of the School as well as Director of the Centre.

The philosophical orientation of this new, one-year program was multi-disciplinary, stressing the applications of theoretical knowledge and empirical analysis in the Canadian setting. The curriculum emphasis was on a required core body of knowledge covering the fundamental aspects of contemporary industrial relations, together with three special elective areas to permit in — dept study and specialization and to provide the necessary flexibility to meet individual student career aspirations and diverse market opportunities. To graduate, students were required to complete ten one-term courses, consisting of six core courses and four electives. There was also a required non-credit three-term policy and research seminar.

The required core courses in the new program were: 1) Canadian Industrial Relations, 2) Labour Law, 3) Human Resources and Human Behaviour, 4) Labour Market Analysis and Manpower Policy, 5) Quantitative Methods, and 6) a Research Essay. Electives could be chosen from three stream areas — Collective Bargaining and Labour Law; Personnel and Human Relations; and Labour Market Analysis and Policy. Students might also select electives from outside the three stream areas depending on their background and interests.

Enrolment in the MIR program was to be limited to 20 students for the first year and 30 in each of the next four. It quickly became evident that there was indeed a demand for such a program. During the four years that the School has been in existence, the class has grown to its maximum size, despite admission standards which limit enrolment to those with superior undergraduate records or relevant work experience. Moreover, the program has attracted a good mix of students, contributing to its value. In the 1985-86 class, for example, about one-third of the students had extensive full-time work experience, a few already held graduate degrees, and every province in Canada was represented.

Happily, there also has been a demand for the graduates of the MIR program. Those who have completed the program have gone on to teaching positions in universities and colleges, to research positions with government, unions and independent agencies, and to industrial relations and personnel management positions in both the public and private sectors.

Although the preparation for this new program and the subsequent operation of it took up a considerable amount of the time of Don Wood and his associates, it was nevertheless «business as usual» as far as the regular functions of the Industrial Relations Centre were concerned. Throughout this period, there was no cutback in any of the Centre's activities. The Current Scene continued to be an important element in the Centre's continuing education and research subscription programs, the annual seminars were, as usual, oversubscribed, there were many new publications — on compensation, labour turnover, labour law, collective bargaining, trade unionism, pensions etc. — there were important conferences on labour law and on Canadian labour markets (the latter a joint undertaking with the John Deutsch Memorial for the Study of Economic Policy). The continued vitality of the Centre during this period showed that the establishment of a School of Industrial Relations need not take anything away from the work of the Centre. The early experience, in fact, indicates strongly that each gains from the existence of the other.

## A NEW DIRECTOR

To the undoubted surprise of everyone who did not know his date of birth, Don Wood retired in 1985. His successor as Director of the Centre and the School was Donald D. Carter, a professor in the Faculty of Law at Queen's.

The new Director is a graduate of Queen's (BA and LLB) and of Oxford University (BCL) and has been a professor of law since 1968. He is associate editor of *Labour Arbitration Cases*, co-author of *Labour Law and Industrial Relations in Canada*, and author of numerous articles and reports. His credentials, however, go far beyond the formally academic for he has a practical experience that equips him well for the dual role of Director of the School and the Centre, well-known arbitrator, Chairman of the Ontario Labour Relations Boards from 1976 to 1979.

It is early to talk of the «Carter years» — the Carter years lie ahead. However, in the short period that he has been Director, it appears to an outsider that Don Carter has moved quickly to build on the foundations established by his predecessor. He has expanded the range of the Centre's publications, broadened the base of multi-disciplinary communications, and put a personal stamp on the day-to-day management of the Centre and School. His imprint undoubtedly will be as marked and significant as that of his predecessors.

## CONTINUING CONTRIBUTIONS

This review of industrial relations at Queen's since 1937 has not covered all of the important contributions made by the Section, Department and Centre, for some of them have been contributions of a continuing nature rather than occurrences that can be placed chronologically.

One of these is the contribution that the Centre has made over a period of 25 years to the training of students in industrial relations. During that period, many graduate students in economics, business and law were employed as part-time research assistants in the Centre, gaining useful work experience which complemented their studies.

Another important function over the years has been liaison with industrial relations practitioners, policy makers, and academic scholars and researchers. From the earliest stage, Cameron recognized the importance of keeping in touch with the world outside, which he did by visiting senior people in industry, unions and government, by speaking to various groups, by participating in policy formulation and in activities such as conciliation and arbitration. Don Wood was no less active in meeting these public relations and public policy responsibilities. During this tenure as Director, for example, he made over 200 speeches, participated in many research conferences, served on numerous advisory committees, conducted studies for Royal Commissions, etc. The Centre's Associate Director, Pradeep Kumar, has also made significant contributions of the same nature.



A chronological review also can not adequately record the important contributions made by many individuals, inside and outside the university, to the success of industrial relations at Queen's. Within the university, for example, Queen's principals have been highly supportive of industrial relations over the past 50 years (and most of them, remarkably, have been involved in the field in some capacity or other). We have already discussed the roles of Wallace and his successor, Mackintosh, in founding the Section. They and their successors also showed a close interest in the work of the Section, Department and Centre. J.A. Corry, who taught a course in the Department of Industrial Relations for many years, was a frequent visitor to the Centre while Principal. John Deutsch, whose many accomplishments included serving on Royal Commissions and other bodies dealing with manpower, unemployment insurance, pensions, etc., was a speaker at many of the Centre's conferences and seminars and had close ties to the Centre as both Vice-Principal and Principal. Ronald Watts had no direct link with the field but showed strong interest in the Centre's activities during the ten years that he served as Principal. His strong encouragement and support were most evident in the development of the Master of Industrial Relations program offered through the new School of Industrial Relations. The current Principal, David Smith, has shown the same keen interest in the work of the Centre and School as he did during the many years he was a Faculty Associate in the Centre. This support from the top over the years undoubtedly has been an important factor behind the success of the Section, Department, Centre and School.

Another group of individuals has made large contributions to industrial relations at Queen's — those who have been speakers at the many conferences, seminars and symposia that have been held in the past 50 years. They number in the hundreds and a listing of even those who were frequent speakers during this period would take up considerable space. Mention must be made, however, of a few who participated so frequently over such long periods that they almost could be considered honorary members of the staff — from the Cameron and early Wood years, Don Guthrie of Du Pont, and over the past 25 years Ray Alden of Stelco, Phil Chaston of Shell Oil, W.G. («Johnny») Johnston of Ontario Hydro, Don MacEachern of Towers-Perrin, C.P. («Connie») Quinn of the Management Education Center, Ann Arbor, and Roy Heenan of Johnson, Heenan and Blaikie. The success of the Centre's continuing education program can be attributed largely to these and the many other outstanding speakers who have been willing to share their knowledge and expertise with participants.

Although the Centre's continuing education programs have been aimed largely at management (trade unions have a well-developed education and training system of their own) the Centre has always made a point of ensuring that the views of the labour movement were presented at these seminars and many well-known union leaders and officials have accepted invitations to speak at Queen's over the years — Shirley Carr, Bill Dodge, Lynn Williams, Stan Little, Neil Reimer, Mike Rygus, Ed Finn — to name a few who have visited on several occasions. An increasing number of trade unions in Canada have also contributed to the Centre through participation in its research and publications subscription program.

Two of those who were instrumental in bringing industrial relations to Queen's — Clarence Hicks and Bryce Stewart — had a continuing influence in other ways. Hicks, who died in 1944, is commemorated by a fellowship that was established in his name at Queen's and at each of the five US universities where he helped to found Industrial Relations Sections. The fellowship is awarded each year to a student who is found «to give promise of a successful career as an executive or teacher in industrial relations by reason of a balanced combination of scholarship and previous study in this or related fields, personality and temperament, participation in student activities and standing among his fellow students and associates». The fellowship has enabled many Queen's students to pursue careers in industrial relations.

Bryce Stewart maintained his association with Queen's as a member of the Board of Trustees from 1941 until his death in 1956. Much of his personal library was donated in the early 1970s to the Industrial Relations Centre Library (officially, the Cameron-Stewart Library). Stewart's contributions were summarized in a formal statement prepared at that time by the Director of the Centre:

To Bryce Stewart the Industrial Centre is indebted for the initiative that brought about the establishment in 1937 of the first industrial relations institute in a Canadian university, for his pioneering work in marshalling support during its early years and for constant interest and guidance during the fifteen years he served as a trustee of Queen's.

Stewart's outstanding contributions in the field of industrial relations were recognized by the University by the award of an LLD in 1955.

Although the scope of industrial relations is essentially the same today as it was in the time of Stewart and Hicks and Mackintosh, there have been many changes in the field and changes affecting it in the 50 years since the Industrial Relations Section was established at Queen's. We have gone from a blue-collar work force to one in which white-collar workers are now the majority, from one composed largely of males to one in which women now form almost an equal number, from one in which almost everyone was a full-time employee to one where part-time workers are a sizable minority. Paralleling these changes, we have seen a radical change in the composition of the labour movement in Canada — from a movement consisting of traditional craft and emerging industrial unions to one in which unions of civil servants, teachers, nurses and other white-collar workers are a significant force. We have seen a tremendous expansion in labour relations legislation, in working conditions legislation, in social security, human rights, and health and safety legislation. We have seen a huge growth in the scope of collective bargaining, changes in the structure of bargaining, the emergence of new methods of dispute settlement. The history of the Industrial Relations Section, Department, Centre and School encompasses all of these changes. Throughout this period, in whatever institutional form it has existed, it has been a recorder and analyst of these developments and trends, an educator within the university and in the outside world, a shaper of policy. In these various roles, it has established a reputation, not just as the pioneer in industrial relations in Canadian universities, but as the leading institute in the field. As it enters its second half-century, it can look back on a solid record of accomplishment with the promise of much more to come.